

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13, 16-19, 25-29, 31-43, 47-56, and 58 are pending in the present application. Claims 14, 15, 20-24, 30, 44-46, and 57 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to speed prosecution in this application. Claims 25-28, 47, 48, 50 and 58 have been amended to be rewritten in independent form without introducing any new matter. Claims 16, 17, 32, 35, and 37 have been amended to formal matters raised in the outstanding Action without the introduction of any new matter.

The outstanding Official Action presented an objection to Claims 25-29, 47-51, and 58 in the Office Action Summary, an objection to Claim 16 for using parentheses, a rejection of Claims 16, 17, 32, and 35-37 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, a rejection of Claims 14, 20-24, 30, 44-46, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Papierniak et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,934,687, Papierniak), and a rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papierniak in view of Lange (U.S. Patent No. 6,321,212).

As an initial matter, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the allowance of Claims 1-13, 18, 19, 31, 33, 34, 38-43, and 52-56. Applicants also acknowledge the clarification by the Examiner<sup>1</sup> that objection to Claims 25-29, 47-51, and 58 in the Office Action Summary was based on these claims being dependent on a rejected base claim, and that these claims would be considered allowable if properly presented in independent form.

Applicants further acknowledge with gratitude the Examiner's consideration of and acknowledgement<sup>2</sup> that the proposed changes to Claims 16, 17, 35, and 37<sup>3</sup> would overcome the objection to Claim 16 and the rejection of Claims 16, 17, and 35-37 under the second

---

<sup>1</sup> During the telephone discussion held on May 4, 2006.

<sup>2</sup> During the telephone discussion held on May 5, 2006.

<sup>3</sup> That were included as part of the facsimile forwarded to the Examiner on May 4, 2006.

paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The further suggestion that proposed Claim 32 needed to be rewritten in independent form is also gratefully acknowledged.

Turning to the objection made as to Claim 16 and the rejection of this claim under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, the present amendment, which incorporates the changes in above-noted proposed Claim 16, is believed to overcome the objection and rejection as previously acknowledged by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the outstanding objection and rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully submitted to be in order along with an indication that amended Claim 16 is now allowed.

With regard to the further rejection of Claims 17, 32, and 35-37 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should also be withdrawn in light of the present amendment that presents Claims 17, 35, and 37 with the approved modifications of above-noted proposed Claims 17, 35, and 37 and the presentation of Claim 32 in the suggested independent form. Accordingly, an indication that amended Claims 17, 32, 35, and 37 are now considered to be allowable along with Claim 36 that depends from amended Claim 35 is respectfully requested.

The above-noted objection to Claims 25-29, 47-51, and 58 in the Office Action Summary is also respectfully submitted to be overcome by the present amendment. In this regard, the present Amendment rewrites Claims 47, 48, and 50 in independent form to include all the limitations of now canceled independent base Claim 44, there being no intervening claim, and rewrites Claim 58 in independent form to include all the limitations of now canceled independent base Claim 57, there being no intervening claim. Accordingly, it is believed that this objection should also be withdrawn and that rewritten independent Claims 47, 48, 50, and 58 be acknowledged to be allowable along with Claim 49 that depends on rewritten independent Claim 48 and Claim 51 that depends on Claim 49.

Turning to the rejection of Claims 14, 20-24, 30, 44-46, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Papierniak and the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papierniak in view of Lange, it is respectfully submitted that the cancellation of Claims 14, 15, 20-24, 30, 44-46, and 57 renders these rejections moot in this application.

As no other issues are believed to remain outstanding relative to this application, it is believed to be clear that this application is in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable action to this effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gregory J. Maier", is written over a horizontal line.

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.  
Registration No. 40,440